



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,114	11/03/2005	Toshiyasu Yabe	9683/231	8518
27879 7590 03/22/2010 INDIANAPOLIS OFFICE: 27879 BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE CAPITAL CENTER, SUITE 1100 201 NORTH ILLINOIS STREET INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-4220				
EXAMINER				
NILANONT, YOUAPORN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2446				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/22/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/526,114

**Applicant(s)**

YABE ET AL.

**Examiner**

YOUAPORN NILANONT

**Art Unit**

2446

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-15-2009
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In view of the Amendment After Final filed on 10-19-2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below. Please disregard Advisory Action mailed November 11-03-2009 and Supplement Action mailed 2-23-2010 which are made in mistake.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446.

### **Status of Claims:**

Claims 13-32 are pending in this Office action.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see page 11-14, filed 10-19-2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Ralston et al. (US 6482773), McCormick et al. (US 6421709) and Druckenmiller et al. (US 6167435).

**Applicant's invention as claimed:**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

**Claims 13, 17-18 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston et al. (US 6842773) in view of McCormick et al. (US 6421709) in view of Druckenmiller et al. (US 6167435).**

As per claim 13, (Previously Presented) An email delivery system (Ralston, figure 1 "mail system 112" and column 3 lines 60-61), comprising:

a terminal station accommodated in a first communication network (Ralston, figure 1 "user 116" and column 3 lines 60-62), the terminal station configured to receive emails from senders transmitted via the first communication network (Ralston, figure 1 "Internet 108" and column 3 lines 54-56, 60-65);

the terminal station further configured to transmit the received identification information of the respective sender over the first communication

network (Ralston, column 4 lines 66-67 thru column 5 lines 1-8 asserts that the user 116 sends "IP address of the domains" identifying the sender to the mail system 112 "without needing a customer service representative" through "an automated mechanism"); and

a relay apparatus (Ralston, figure 1 "mail system 112") configured to receive the identification information of the respective sender transmitted from the terminal station over the first communication network (Ralston, column 4 lines 66-67 thru column 5 lines 1-8 asserts that the mail system 112 receive identification of mail sender from the user 116), and store the received identification information (Ralston, figure 2 "approved list 216");

the relay apparatus further configured to receive all emails forwarded from the second communication network to the first communication network (Ralston, figure 1 "mail system 112" and column 3 lines 45-48); and

the relay apparatus further configured to forward to the terminal station only those emails that include the identification information stored by the relay apparatus of the terminal station (Ralston, column 4 lines 63-65 "Messages sent by members of the approved list 216 are stored in the user mail storage 212", column 4 lines 49-50 "user mail storage 212 is a repository for email messages sent to the account for the user").

While Ralston discloses of adding sender's identification to an approved list, Ralston may have not explicitly disclosed the stored approved list is user specific, i.e. stored in association with each user.

McCormick discloses an email filtering system which stores a list of email addresses that a user allows to be immediately forwarded to user's inbox (McCormick, figure 2 "Add to Guest List 60", column 4 lines 30-39, lines 54-59 and 66-67, column 5 lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teaching of McCormick to include individualized safe list filter in the Ralston's system in order to provide individual user with control of his own email filtering list (McCormick, column 2 lines 42-47).

Ralston in view of McCormick does not explicitly disclose user subscribing to a mailing list of the transmitter.

Druckenmiller disclose:

the terminal station further configured to receive identification information from a transmitting apparatus of a respective sender responsive to a user registration request, the transmitting apparatus accommodated in a second communication network (Druckenmiller, column 4 lines 31-55 "presenting appropriate subscription form in response to the request of an interested party...");

the relay apparatus further configured to control the terminal station to register the email address of the user of the terminal station as a recipient email address at the transmitting apparatus of the respective sender identified with the identification information (Druckenmiller, column 5 lines 17-32 "confirming subscribers may enter the confirmation information directly via a confirmation

form located at a designated confirmation URL", figure 3 "hit REPLY on this message").

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined Druckenmiller's teachings with the teachings of Ralston in view of McCormick in order to allow user to subscribe to email services of interest (Druckenmiller, column 1 lines 32-36).

As per claim 17, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the email delivery system according to Claim 13, wherein the transmitting apparatus of the respective sender is a plurality of transmitting apparatuses of a plurality of respective senders each having different identification information (Ralston, column 3 lines 40-44),

the terminal station further configured to prompt a user of the terminal station to select one of the plurality of respective senders for whom identification information is received (Ralston, column 4 lines 66-67, column 5 lines 1-3), and

the terminal station further configured to transmit the identification information of the one of the plurality of respective senders to the relay apparatus in response to selection by the user of the one of the plurality of respective senders (Ralston, column 3 lines 40-44, column 4 lines 66-67, column 5 lines 1-3).

As per claim 18, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller teaches the email delivery system according to Claim 13, wherein the relay apparatus is further configured to control the terminal station to provide a user interface (Ralston column 3

lines 51-54; McCormick, figure 2) to transmit the identification information to the relay apparatus, and the relay apparatus is further configured to receive the identification information transmitted in response to a user input received via the user interface (Ralston column 3 lines 54-56; McCormick, column 6 lines 22-28).

As per claim 19, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the email delivery system according to Claim 18, wherein the relay apparatus is further configured to transmit to the terminal station a file, written in a prescribed language, the file describing procedures to provide the user interface and to cause the terminal station to forward the identification information to the relay apparatus in response to receipt of the user input (McCormick, column 4 lines 30-39).

As per claim 24, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the email delivery system according to Claim 13, wherein the identification information comprises a registration screen, and the terminal station is further configured to provide the registration screen in a user interface to prompt for transmittal of the identification information to the relay apparatus (McCormick, figures 2, 4-7), and the relay apparatus is further configured to receive an identifier of the terminal station and a delivery permission request transmitted in response to a user input to the registration screen received via the user interface (McCormick, column 5 lines 49-63 and column 6 lines 22-28).

As per claim 25, (Previously Presented) Ralston discloses a relay apparatus, comprising:



a first communication unit (Ralston, figure 1 "mail system 112", figure 2 "mail transfer agent(s) 204") configured to receive identification information from a terminal station over a first communication network (Ralston, column 4 lines 66-67 thru column 5 lines 1-8 asserts that the mail system 112 receive identification of mail sender from the user 116), the identification information identifying a sender of an email which a user of the terminal station wishes to receive (Ralston, figure 2 "approved list 216", column 4 lines 58-61 "contact is previously assented to" shows to user's wish to receive emails from senders on the approved list);

a storage unit configured to store the identification information received by the first communication unit (Ralston, figure 2 "approved list 216");

a second communication unit configured to receive emails over a second communication network (Ralston, figure 6A "begin receiving mail message from Internet 604");

the processor further configured to forward to the terminal station over the first communication network those received emails confirmed to include the identification information of the sender stored in association with the email address of the user (Ralston, column 4 lines 63-65 "Messages sent by members of the approved list 216 are stored in the user mail storage 212", column 4 lines 49-50 "user mail storage 212 is a repository for email messages sent to the account for the user").

While Ralston discloses of adding sender's identification to an approved list, Ralston may have not explicitly disclosed the stored approved list is user specific, i.e.

stored in association with each user and may not explicitly show communication between different networks.

McCormick discloses an email filtering system which stores a list of email addresses that a user allows to be immediately forwarded to user's inbox (McCormick, figure 2 "Add to Guest List 60", column 4 lines 30-39, lines 54-59 and 66-67, column 5 lines 1-5). Further McCormick discloses emails transferring between wide area network (Internet) and local area network (LAN) (see McCormick, figure 3).

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teaching of McCormick to include individualized safe list filter in the Ralston's system in order to provide individual user with control of his own email filtering list (McCormick, column 2 lines 42-47). In addition, it is commonly known and obvious in the art that computer networks comprise of multiple different networks such as LAN and WAN as shown in McCormick.

Ralston in view of McCormick does not explicitly disclose user subscribing to a mailing list of the transmitter.

Druckenmiller disclose a processor configured to direct the terminal station to transmit a request to register the email address of the user as a recipient email address at a transmitting apparatus of the sender identified with the identification information (Druckenmiller, column 5 lines 17-32 "confirming subscribers may enter the confirmation information directly via a confirmation form located at a designated confirmation URL", figure 3 "hit REPLY on this message").

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined Druckenmiller's teachings with the teachings of Ralston in view of McCormick in order to allow user to subscribe to email services of interest (Druckenmiller, column 1 lines 32-36).

As per claim 26, (Previously Presented) Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the relay apparatus of claim 25, wherein the identification information is included in a first file generated with the transmitting apparatus and configured to provide a display on the terminal station (Ralston, figure 4), the first file further configured to generate and initiate transmission to the relay apparatus of a request for a second file from the relay apparatus, the second file including an identifier of the terminal station (Druckenmiller, figure 3, column 3 lines 40-54).

As per claim 27, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the relay apparatus of claim 26, wherein the identifier of the terminal station is a telephone number of the terminal station, and the relay apparatus is further configured to identify the email address of the user of the terminal station based on the telephone number, and store the identification information in association with the telephone number and the email address of the user (Druckenmiller, column 8 lines 49-65).

As per claim 28, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the relay apparatus of claim 25, wherein the processor is further configured to generate and transmit to the terminal station a delivery permission to transmit the request (Druckenmiller, figure 3, column 3 lines 40-54), the delivery permission registration screen comprising a user selection selectable by the user to initiate generation and

transmittal to the transmitting apparatus of the request to register the email address of the user at the transmitting apparatus (Druckenmiller, figure 3, column 3 lines 40-54).

As per claim 29, (Previously Presented) Ralston discloses a method of selectively delivering email messages to a terminal station (Ralston, column 4 lines 27-34), the method comprising:

a relay device communicating with the terminal station over a first communication network (Ralston, figure 2 "mail system 112");

the relay device also communicating with an information providing server over a second communication network (Ralston, figure 2 "Unsolicited Mailer 104");

the relay device receiving from the terminal station identification information of the information providing server (Ralston, column 4 lines 66-67 thru column 5 lines 1-8 asserts that the mail system 112 receive identification of mail sender from the user 116), the identification information obtained by the terminal station from the information providing server (Ralston, figure 1 "Internet 108" and column 3 lines 54-56, 60-65);

the relay device storing the identification information (Ralston, figure 2 "approved list 216");

the relay device receiving over the second communication network an email addressed to the user of the terminal station (Ralston, figure 1 "mail system 112" and column 3 lines 45-48) based on registration by the terminal station with the information providing server (Ralston, column 4 lines 58-65 "assented to");

confirming with the relay device that the email includes the identification information of the information providing server stored in association with the identifier of the user of the terminal station (Ralston, figures 5C and E-F "Pre-Screen messages for blocked/approved sources"); and

the relay device, responsive to confirmation, relaying the email to the terminal station over the first communication network (Ralston, column 4 lines 63-65 "Messages sent by members of the approved list 216 are stored in the user mail storage 212", column 4 lines 49-50 "user mail storage 212 is a repository for email messages sent to the account for the user").

While Ralston discloses of adding sender's identification to an approved list, Ralston may have not explicitly disclosed the stored approved list is user specific, i.e. stored in association with each user.

McCormick discloses an email filtering system which stores a list of email addresses that a user allows to be immediately forwarded to user's inbox (McCormick, figure 2 "Add to Guest List 60", column 4 lines 30-39, lines 54-59 and 66-67, column 5 lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teaching of McCormick to include individualized safe list filter in the Ralston's system in order to provide individual user with control of his own email filtering list (McCormick, column 2 lines 42-47).

Ralston in view of McCormick does not explicitly disclose user subscribing to a mailing list of the transmitter.

Druckenmiller disclose:

the relay device directing the terminal station to register with the information providing server to receive communications from the information providing server (Druckenmiller, column 5 lines 17-32 "confirming subscribers may enter the confirmation information directly via a confirmation form located at a designated confirmation URL", figure 3 "hit REPLY on this message").

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined Druckenmiller's teachings with the teachings of Ralston in view of McCormick in order to allow user to subscribe to email services of interest (Druckenmiller, column 1 lines 32-36).

As per claim 30, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the method of claim 29, further comprising transmitting a service registration request for receipt by the information providing server (Druckenmiller, column 3 lines 7-10), and receiving with the terminal station from the information providing server the identification information of the information providing server in response to the service registration request (Druckenmiller, column 3 lines 37-39, figure 3).

As per claim 31, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the method of claim 30, wherein receiving with the terminal station the identification information comprises displaying a process instruction screen on the terminal station (Druckenmiller, figure 3), and generating and transmitting to the relay device a relay registration request that includes the identification information in response to receipt of a

user selection from the process instruction screen (Ralston, column 10 lines 36-46 "user assents to receiving the e-mail broadcast").

As per claim 32, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the method of claim 29, wherein the relay device directing the terminal station to register with the information providing server comprises the relay device transmitting a file for receipt and display by the terminal station, the file comprising a user selection to initiate registration, and code responsive to selection by the user of the user selection to generate and transmit a registration request to the information providing server (Druckenmiller, figure 3, column 3 lines 40-54).

**Claims 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston et al. (US 6842773) in view of McCormick et al. (US 6421709) in view of Druckenmiller et al. (US 6167435) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Common Knowledge in the Art.**

As per claim 14, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller teaches the email delivery system according to Claim 13.

Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller does not explicitly disclose that the identification information of a sender is assigned in the second communication network to identify a sender of an email. However, it was commonly known in the art that the sender's email address as specified and used as sender's identification in both Ralston and McCormick references are assigned in the sender's own network and not in the receiver's network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have assumed that the sender's email address was assigned to the sender by the sender's network in order to conform to the existing email system without additional effort.

As per claim 22, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller teaches the email delivery system according to Claim 13.

Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller does not explicitly state wherein on receiving the identification information transmitted from a terminal station, the relay apparatus determines whether to allow the user of the terminal station to make use of the relay apparatus itself, only in the case of allowing the user, the relay apparatus obtains an email address of the user, and stores the obtained email address corresponding to the identification information transmitted from the terminal station.

However, it was commonly known in the art at the time of the invention that any mail system such as used in Ralston reference (Ralston column 3 lines 45-67) and McCormick reference requires a login by the user of such terminal before he can access his emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have included a user login page prompted by the terminal in Ralston email system for the security and privacy purposes.

**Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston et al. (US 6842773) in view of McCormick et al. (US 6421709) in view**



**of Druckenmiller et al. (US 6167435) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Katsikas (US 6868498).**

As per claim 15, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller does not explicitly teach email filtering system that identifies sender by a prescribed number of characters that begin an email. However, Ralston does discuss domain where the solicited emails are sent from and the use of email address to identify email to be filtered (Ralston, column 5 lines 3 and 38-40). Further, McCormick teaches text string entered by user to identify message to be filtered which contains '@' (McCormick, column 4 lines 57-59).

Katsikas teaches the identification information of the respective sender is a prescribed number of characters that begin an email address of the respective sender (Katsikas, column 10 lines 35-67 "a secondary action", column 11 lines 1-7 "%username% is substituted with the sender's email address").

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have utilized the teaching of Katsikas with the teachings of Ralston, McCormick and Druckenmiller, in order to efficiently allow the user to specify username to be identified as sender within the filtering system.

As per claim 16, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller does not explicitly teach email filtering system that identifies sender by a prescribed number of characters that end an email. However, Ralston does discuss domain where the solicited emails are sent from and the use of email address to identify email to be filtered (Ralston, column 5 lines 3 and 38-40). Further, McCormick teaches text string

entered by user to identify message to be filtered which contains '@' (McCormick, column 4 lines 57-59).

Katsikas teaches the identification information of the respective sender is a prescribed number of characters that begin an email address of the respective sender (Katsikas, column 10 lines 35-42 "microsoft.com" or ".mil").

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have utilized the teaching of Katsikas with the teachings of Ralston, McCormick and Druckenmiller, in order to efficiently allow the user to specify ending of the email name which shows domain name to be identified as sender within the filtering system.

**Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston et al. (US 6842773) in view of McCormick et al. (US 6421709) in view of Druckenmiller et al. (US 6167435) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Mathur et al. (US 6581072).**

As per claim 20, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the email delivery system according to Claim 19, wherein the terminal station is further configured to transmit the identification information and then delete the file transmitted from the relay apparatus (McCormick, figure 2, column 4 lines 30-39, column 6 lines 9-11 and 38-50).

Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller does not explicitly disclose that the terminal station deletes the file transmitted from the relay apparatus.

However, Mathur reference discloses a system that allows the user to delete web page cookies in order for user to preserve privacy (Mathur, column 15 lines 10-13, 15-16).

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have used Mathur technique of deleting cookies or transmitted files in Ralston's and Wilson's terminal station in order to protect privacy of the user of the terminal station (Mathur, column 15 lines 15-16).

As per claim 21, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the email delivery system according to Claim 19, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the relay apparatus is further configured to prohibit the terminal station from storing a locator of the file indicative that the file was provided from the relay apparatus.

However, Mathur reference discloses a system that provides filter that allows automatic deletion of web page cookies in order for user to preserve privacy (Mathur, column 15, lines 13-20).

It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have used Mathur technique of deleting cookies or transmitted files in Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller's terminal station in order to protect privacy of the user of the terminal station (Mathur, column 15 lines 15-16).

**Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston et al. (US 6842773) in view of McCormick et al. (US 6421709) in view of**

**Druckenmiller et al. (US 6167435) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Adkins (US 2004/0243844).**

As per claim 23, Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller discloses the email delivery system according to Claim 13, wherein the terminal station obtains from a sender of an email identification information, the identification information identifying a sender of an email the terminal station transmits to the relay apparatus the obtained identification information (Ralston, column 3 lines 40-44), the relay apparatus receives the identification information (Ralston, column 4 lines 49-61).

Ralston in view of McCormick in view of Druckenmiller does not teach the system wherein the terminal station transmits to the relay apparatus time information indicating a time of obtaining the identification information, the relay apparatus receives the time information transmitted from the terminal station, only in the case that difference between the time indicated by the received time information and the time of receiving the time information are shorter than a prescribed time, the relay apparatus stores the received identification information corresponding to the email address of the user of the terminal station.

However, the Adkins reference teaches an email system with unwanted email filter that allows the user to filter the temporary list to include only identification of sender of message sent within a specified time wherein the user is able to add a sender's identification in that temporary list to the inclusive list (page 4 [0065]-[0067]).

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have included such timing feature as taught by Adkins into

modified Ralston's email system, in order to automatically limit the number of sender's identification to be added to the user's inclusive list.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOUPAPORN NILANONT whose telephone number is (571) 270-5655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and alternate Friday at 8:30 AM - 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey C. Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Y. N./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Jeffrey Pwu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446

